

Appl. No. 09/530,200

Response to Office Action dated February 24, 2009

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 24, 2009. Claims 1, 4, 7-24, 27, 30-32 and 34-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 7-24, 27, 30-32, and 34-39 are rejected. In the amendment, Claims 1, 17, 27, 31, and 39 are amended and Claims 40-41 are newly added. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

In the Office Action, Claims 27, 30-32, 36, 37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the processes 1) are not tied to another statutory category and 2) do not transform the underlying subject matter to a different state or thing. The Examiner states "outputting and displaying to a user would tie such a claim to another statutory category." Office Action, page 6, lines 1-2. Independent Claims 27, 31 and 39 have been amended according to the Examiner's recommendation. Support for the amendment can be found at page 12, lines 12-20 and Fig. 2 of the specification. In light of the amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection with respect to Claims 27, 31 and 39 and the claims that depend thereon be reconsidered and the rejections withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 7-24, 27 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,896 to Yamauchi et al. ("Yamauchi"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants respectfully disagree that, at a minimum, the patterns disclosed in Fig. 42 and the representations in Fig. 74 teach re-converting "by exchanging word order of the at least one representation" as claimed in Claims 1, 17, 27, and 31. See Office Action, page 8, line 9 – page 9, line 4.

First, Yamauchi's editing of the selected source-language sentence, as relied upon by the Examiner to teach re-converting, does not change the pattern of the source-language sentence or the word order of the source-language sentence. See Office Action, page 8, lines 3-8. "[A] representing pattern corresponding to the selected source-language sentence is decided." Yamauchi, column 50, lines 45-47. Thus, regardless of the editing process, the same pattern for the source-language sentence will be used for translation. In other words, Yamauchi's editing process does not switch the pattern of the selected source-language sentence from "<Pattern>"

Appl. No. 09/530,200

Response to Office Action dated February 24, 2009

([test| <SOMETHING>])" to "(<AltPat> (<SOMETHING> |be tested|)" or between the patterns in Fig. 74. Rather than changing the word order of the source-language sentence, the editing process merely changes a word in the selected-source sentence. Yamauchi discloses "a word **changed** in the editing process is detected." Yamauchi, column 49, lines 42-43 (emphasis added). For example, "koisha" is changed to "karera" in the editing process. See Yamauchi, column 50, lines 50-55.

Claims 1, 17, 27, and 31 have been amended to clarify the re-converting is after the at least one representation is confirmed. Applicants submit, that once Yamauchi's source-language sentence is selected, the source-language sentence's pattern and word order do not change.

Second, "(<Pattern>) ([test| <SOMETHING>])" and "(<AltPat> (<SOMETHING> |be tested|)" disclosed in Fig. 42 represent **target-language** phrase patterns, and not source-language patterns. Yamauchi, column 30, lines 49-59. Thus, the target-language phrase patterns could not be a re-conversion or be used to re-convert the selected source-language sentence.

Claims 1, 17, 27, and 31 have been amended to clarify that the re-converted representation is in the first natural language.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection with respect to Claims 1, 17, 27, and 31 and the claims that depend thereon be reconsidered and the rejections withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,505 to Fushimoto ("Fushimoto"). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

First, Applicants submit that, at a minimum, the cited prior art, even if properly combinable, fails to teach "each of the plurality of representations of the second natural language has a one-to-one correspondence with a representation of a third natural language" as claimed in Claims 38 and 39. The Examiner recognizes that Yamauchi fails to teach this element and instead relies on Fushimoto's French to English representations in Fig. 8. See Office Action, page 23, lines 5-8. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that one French word corresponds to multiple English words. For example, the French word "trouver" corresponds to the English words "find," "detect," "deem," "discover," and "judge." Fushimoto, Fig. 8. Similarly, the German word "finden" corresponds to the English words "find" and "discover;"

Appl. No. 09/530,200
Response to Office Action dated February 24, 2009

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 26 2009

and the English word "find" corresponds to the French words "trouver" and "estimer." Fushimoto, Fig. 8.

Second, Applicants do not recite "processing means for implementing processing to the first natural language inputted at the input means in accordance with result of the confirmation at the confirmation means" in Claims 38 and 39 as the Examiner states. Office Action, page 22, lines 12-16. Rather, Applicants recite "processing means for translating the at least one representation of the second natural language to the third natural language." Applicants respectfully submit that Yamauchi and Fushimoto fail to teach this element.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the obviousness rejections with respect to Claims 38 and 39 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants further note that Claims 40 and 41 are newly added. Claims 40 and 41 recite, in part, "wherein the at least one representation of the second natural language that is translated into the third natural language is at least one sentence." The claims are fully supported by the specification. For example, see page 23, lines 5-17.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter as defined in the newly added claims is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and for the additional patentable elements recited therein. For example, Fushimoto merely discloses translation of a single word using multilingual dictionaries. See e.g. Fushimoto, column 6, line 51 – column 7, line 19 and Fig. 8.

Conclusion

For at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of the same.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-779 on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,
K&L GATES LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso (46,541)
Customer No. 29175

Dated: May 26, 2009